

SOUTH DAVIS COUNTY TRANSIT DEIS

West Bountiful Sub-Committee Meeting No. 3 - Summary

Project:
South Davis County Transit DEIS

Meeting Purpose:
West Bountiful Sub-Committee Meeting No. 3

Meeting
2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
April 14, 2007

Location:
West Bountiful City Hall

Attendee

Angelo Papastamos
Kerry Doanne
Kim Clark
Jacqueline Jensen
Saffron Capson
Colleen Lavery
Robin Hutcheson
Michael Eggett
Cheryl Searle
Wendell Wild (representative)
Dave Jelmini
Randy Lloyd
Jim Hanks

Representing

UDOT
UTA
VIA
H.W. Lochner
H.W. Lochner
Carter & Burgess
Fehr & Peers
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member

Meeting Summary:

Process

K. Clark began by explaining where the project currently is in the overall process. She indicated alternatives for the project are currently being evaluated. Input from the next round of sub-committee meetings will be used to accomplish this task. During the next regional workshop attendees will focus specifically on alignments. During the current meeting the focus will be on alternative modes. The Purpose and Need Statement for the study was reviewed with the group. Sub-committee members were referred to their meeting packets for full text copies of all of the meeting materials..

Regional Workshop Recap

K. Clark recapped the exercise conducted at the second Regional Workshop which focused on origins/destinations, alignments, and the identification of modes. A map of the primary and secondary alignments identified at the Regional Workshop was shown to the group.

Universe of Alternatives

K. Clark explained what the “universe of alternatives” entailed and the Universe of Alignments map was shown. Sub-committee members were then taken through the two components to an alternative (alignment and mode).

Alignments

A map of preliminary alignments being taken through the alternatives analysis process was shown to sub-committee members as the study’s preliminary “long list alignments.” K. Clark reviewed the criteria used to narrow down alignments.

Modes

Next, a “universe of modes” list was reviewed with the sub-committee members. As with alignment narrowing criteria, mode narrowing criteria was discussed. The preliminary “long list of modes” was outlined by K. Clark. The list was divided into two categories – bus and rail.

Factors to Consider

K. Clark defined factors to consider when comparing modes. Factors included market, capacity, operating characteristics, costs, environmental/community considerations, and access. After each factor was reviewed, a “dot game” exercise was conducted to determine which three factors are most important to each sub-committee member in considering modes. The following is a list of factors identified by the West Bountiful sub-committee members as most important when considering modes:

| Category | Factors | Number of Dots |
|--|---|----------------|
| Market | Local trips are important. | 0 |
| | Commuter trips are important. | 1 |
| Capacity | | 2 |
| Operating Characteristics | It should stop frequently. | 0 |
| | Minimal travel time. | 0 |
| Costs | | 3 |
| Environmental/Community Considerations | It needs to sit within the context of my community. | 3 |
| | It needs to allow for good traffic flow. | 4 |
| Access | It needs to be easy to board. | 2 |
| | I need to be able to get to it easily. | 2 |

Long List Modes

R. Hutcheson outlined each mode in the preliminary long list of modes, including giving a description and typical characteristics based on how the mode has been implemented in other communities in the United States. After each mode was discussed, the group participated in an exercise to determine the “pros” and “cons” of implementing each mode in their community. Below is a list of pros and cons identified by West Bountiful sub-committee members.

| BUS (4 Dots) | |
|--|--|
| Pro | Con |
| Cost-effective | Time consuming when riders pay cash vs. passes |
| Localized service | |
| Easy implementation (to get it up and running) | |

| BRT – Bus Rapid Transit (2 Dots) | |
|---|---|
| Pro | Con |
| Use Redwood Road to access new developments (Note: new fray) | Designated stops – need to build (more cost than a bus) |
| Flexible | Right-of-way issues – impact road way |
| Serve east/west connectivity | Low-end BRT is equal to a “glorified bus” |
| Recognized at signals – less delay | |

| LRT – Light Rail Transit (0 Dots) | |
|--|------------------------------|
| Pro | Con |
| | Expensive |
| | Doesn't serve West Bountiful |

| Streetcar (0Dots) | |
|--|---|
| Pro | Con |
| Appealing for historic district (if it is a local service, circulator) | Cost for West Bountiful |
| Enhance community | Low ridership |
| Meets east/west needs | Right-of-way issues in West Bountiful community |

| DMU – Diesel Mobile Unit (0 Dots) | |
|--|--|
| Pro | Con |
| Existing infrastructure | Coordination with Commuter Rail (using same track) |
| More stops than Commuter Rail | |

Future Meetings

The next sub-committee meeting will be held on October 16th from 2 :00–4:00 p.m.

Any discrepancies with this meeting summary, please notify Jacqueline Jensen.

Cc: Attendees, Project Contact List, West Bountiful Sub-Committee Members